

From: drupal_admin <drupal_admin@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 9:51 PM
To: HarborComments
Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 09/06/2016 11:51PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email: (b) (6)

Your Comments: My thought is that the public feels a deep dissatisfaction with the current plan insofar that so many acres are left to "active monitoring," instead of requiring Industry to pay a respectful and proportionate amount for dredging, capping, and any other truly "active" means to restoring our public waterways. Industry should pay for the incurred damages to our shared natural resources that are first and foremost publicly owned. The Portland Harbor Superfund plan in its proposed draft form largely lets Industry off the hook. Weighing in the balance are underserved communities that have already felt the effect of fish consumption bans as well as incurred health risks from eating resident fish that are deleterious to human health. Furthermore, the public largely do not want to recreate on the lower Willamette do to ongoing real and perceived pollution in the river that connects directly to the abuse of the river by Industry over the past century. Reviewing the Alternative Plans, I advocate for plan "H". It offers the most thorough amount of capping and dredging, and it makes sense that it would take at least 62 years, given that Industry has spent over 100 years polluting it.